

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International file number PCT/EP2004/053554

Field no. IV: Wording of the Abstract (continuation of point 5, sheet 1)

A device is proposed for impact sensing having an acceleration sensor mechanism (14) on the bumper (10, 12). The acceleration sensor mechanism (14) is situated between the bumper (12) and a bumper fascia (10).

**WRITTEN DECISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCH AUTHORITY**  
**(APPENDED SHEET)**

**International file number PCT/EP2004/053554**

---

**Concerning Point V:**

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

- D1: US 2003/114985 A1 (ISHIZAKI TATSUYA et al.), 19 June 2003 (2003-06-19)
- D2: US 2002/043417 A1 (ISHIZAKI TATSUYA et al.), 18 April 2002 (2002-04-18)
- D3: US 2002/033755 A1 (ISHIZAKI TATSUYA et al.), 21 March 2002 (2002-03-21)
- D4: WO 03/082639 A (AUTOLIV DEVELOPMENT AB; MATHEVON, VINCENT), 9 October 2003 (2003-10-09)
- D5: US-B1- 6 561 301 (HATTORI KATSUHIKO et al.), 13 May 2003 (2003-05-13)
- D6: EP-A-1 350 683 (TAKATA CORPORATION), 8 October 2003 (2003-10-08)
- D7: US 2001/043011 A1 (UGUSA AKI et al.), 22 November 2001 (2001-11-22)
- D8: GB-A-2 376 075 (AB AUTOMOTIVE ELECTRONICS LTD.), 4 December 2002 (2002-12-04)
- D9: DE 297 08 926 U1 (DUISBERG, DIRK, 52068 AACHEN, GERMANY), 17 September 1998 (1998-09-17)

2. Independent Claim 1

2.1. The present application does not meet the requirements of Article 33 (1) PCT because the subject matter of Claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33 (2) PCT. Document D1 (Figures 2-4 and 9 and paragraph 33) discloses (the references in parentheses relate to this document) a

"Device for impact sensing having a first acceleration sensor mechanism (10, 11) situated on the bumper (18a, 18),  
the first acceleration sensor mechanism (11) being situated between the bumper (18a) and a bumper fascia (18)."

3. Dependent Claims 2-7

Claims 2-4, 6, 7 do not contain any features that, in combination with the features of any claim on which they are dependent, meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty or inventive step. Furthermore, it is noted that the features of dependent Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 are also known from documents D1-D3, as can be learned from the search report.

With regard to the features of Claims 4 and 7, documents D4-D7 describe the same advantages as the present application. Someone skilled in the art would therefore regard the incorporation of these features into the device described in D1 or D2 as a standard *constructive* measure for the solution of the posed problem.

Contradicting the requirements of Rule 5.1 a) ii) PCT, the description indicates neither the relevant prior art disclosed in documents D1-D3 nor these documents themselves.